

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nor Ashidi Mat Isa, for the guidance, encouragement and advice he has provided throughout my time as his student. I have been extremely lucky to have a supervisor who cared so much about my work, and who responded to my questions and queries so promptly. He has dedicated his great efforts making sure I stay within research scope while giving me sufficient freedom to seek for my own thought and ideas. This thesis would never have been completed without his continuous guidance. Many thanks to all colleagues in the Imaging and Intelligent System Research Team (ISRT).

I must express my gratitude to Dr. Salem, my husband, for his continued support and encouragement.

Overall, this thesis is dedicated to my parents and I thank them too much for always giving me unconditional love, encouragement and freedom through my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xviii
ABSTRAK	xix
ABSTRACT	xxi
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Current Trend in Image Magnification Algorithms	2
1.3 Problem of Statement	4
1.4 Research Objectives	5
1.5 Research Scope	5
1.6 Thesis Outline	6
CHAPTER 2	8
LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 Digital Image	9
2.2.1 Texture Images	12

2.2.2 Non-Texture Images.....	14
2.2.2.1 Pure Non-Texture Images.....	14
2.2.2.2 Natural Images.....	15
2.2.3 Digital Image Processing	15
2.3 Image Zooming.....	18
2.4 Interpolation Based Magnification (Zoom-in).....	22
2.4.1 Basic Concepts	22
2.4.2 Problems of Interpolation Based Magnification	26
2.4.3 Interpolation Algorithms	28
2.4.3.1 Non-adaptive Interpolation Algorithms.....	29
2.4.3.2 Adaptive Interpolation Algorithms.....	34
2.4.4 Applications of Interpolation Based Magnification	42
2.4.5 Remarks.....	44
2.5 Synthesis Based Zoom-in (Texture Synthesis)	45
2.5.1 Basic Concepts	45
2.5.2 Problems of Texture Synthesis Algorithms	46
2.5.3 Texture Synthesis Algorithms	46
2.5.3.1 Pixel-Based Synthesis Algorithms	47
2.5.3.2 Patch-Based Synthesis Algorithms.....	50
2.5.4 Applications of Texture Synthesis	53
2.5.5 Remarks.....	55

2.6 Latest Interpolation Based Magnification Algorithms	55
2.6.1 Directional Cubic Convolution Interpolation.....	55
2.6.2 Iterative Curvature Based Interpolation technique (ICBI).....	57
2.6.3 Soft-Decision Adaptive Interpolation	59
2.6.4 An Edge-Guided Image Interpolation Algorithm via Directional Filtering and Data Fusion	61
2.7 Summary	62
CHAPTER 3	65
METHODOLOGY	65
3.1 Introduction.....	65
3.2 Motivation.....	67
3.3 Mapping Based Magnification Algorithm (MBMA).....	68
3.3.1 Basic Concept.....	69
3.3.2 The Online Part of MBMA	74
3.3.2.1 Feature Representation Stage	74
3.3.2.2 Matching Stage	79
3.3.2.3 Synthesis Stage	82
3.3.3 The Offline MBMA	84
3.3.3.1 Down Sampling Stage	85
3.3.3.2 Feature Representation	86
3.3.4 Patch-Based Texture Synthesis versus MBMA	88
3.3.5 Interpolation-Based Magnification versus MBMA.....	90

3.4	Data Samples	91
3.5	Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis	94
3.6	Summary	99
CHAPTER 4 - RESULTS AND DISCUSSION		
4.1	Introduction.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2	Optimal Parameters Analysis.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3	Performances Analysis of MBMA_Direct.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3.1	Results for Standard Images.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3.2	Results for MLCP Images	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4	Performances Analysis of MBMA_Average	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.1	Results of Standard Images	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.2	Results for MLCP Images	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.5	Results of Magnifying MLCP Images by 3X and 4X...	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.6	Conclusion	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 5 155		
CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS 155		
5.1	Conclusion	155
5.2	Future Work.....	156
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS 166		

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 4.1	Performance comparison in terms of PSNR between the proposed MBMA_Direct and other state-of-the-art algorithms	118
Table 4.2	Performance comparison in terms of MSE between the proposed MBMA_Direct and other state-of-the-art algorithms	118
Table 4.3	Performance comparison in terms of SSIM between the proposed MBMA_Direct and other state-of-the-art algorithms	118
Table 4.4	Performance comparison in terms of FSIM between the proposed MBMA_Direct and other state-of-the-art algorithms	119
Table 4.5	Performance comparison between the proposed MBMA_Direct and other state-of-the-art algorithms for average of 100 standard and natural images	119
Table 4.6	Performance comparison in terms of PSNR between the proposed MBMA_Direct and other state-of-the-art algorithms	125
Table 4.7	Performance comparison in terms of MSE between the proposed MBMA_Direct and other state-of-the-art algorithms	125
Table 4.8	Performance comparison in terms of SSIM between the proposed MBMA_Direct and other state-of-the-art algorithms	126
Table 4.9	Performance comparison in terms of FSIM between the proposed MBMA_Direct and other state-of-the-art algorithms	126
Table 4.10	Performance comparison between the proposed MBMA_Direct and other state-of-the-art algorithms for average of 200 MLCP images	126
Table 4.11	Performance comparison in terms of PSNR between the proposed MBMA_Average and other state-of-the-art algorithms	138

Table 4.12	Performance comparison in terms of MSE between the proposed MBMA_Average and other state-of-the-art algorithms	138
Table 4.13	Performance comparison in terms of SSIM between the proposed MBMA_Average and other state-of-the-art algorithms	139
Table 4.14	Performance comparison in terms of FSIM between the proposed MBMA_Average and other state-of-the-art algorithms	139
Table 4.15	Performance comparison between the proposed MBMA_Average and other state-of-the-art algorithms for average of 100 standard and natural images	139
Table 4.16	Performance comparison in terms of PSNR between the proposed MBMA_Average and other state-of-the-art algorithms	149
Table 4.17	Performance comparison in terms of MSE between the proposed MBMA_Average and other state-of-the-art algorithms	149
Table 4.18	Performance comparison in terms of SSIM between the proposed MBMA_Average and other state-of-the-art algorithms	149
Table 4.19	Performance comparison in terms of FSIM between the proposed MBMA_Average and other state-of-the-art algorithms	149
Table 4.20	Performance comparison between the proposed MBMA_Average and other state-of-the-art algorithms for average of 200 MLCP images	150

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
Figure 2.1	Digital image is sharper and has better contrast than the analog image (NCGICC, accessed 2013)	10
Figure 2.2	(a) Digital image consists of a collection of pixels arranged in a grid format. (b) Each pixel containing information about its color or intensity	11
Figure 2.3	Digital image types	12
Figure2.4	Examples of texture images based on their types (Liu et al., 2004)	14
Figure 2.5	Examples of non-texture image (a) MLCP image (b) non-texture image full of smooth areas and edges (b) the bicycle image is a non-texture image contains a lot of edges	14
Figure 2.6	Example of natural image	15
Figure 2.7	Digital image processing in a computer vision system (Annadurai and Shanmugalakshmi, 2006)	16
Figure 2.8	Image processing tasks	18
Figure 2.9	Zoom-in or magnification process, (a) Original image, (b) Magnified image	20
Figure 2.10	(a)Original low resolution image, (b)Original image is expanded and the places of unknown values that will be estimated during the zoom-in process	20
Figure 2.11	Interpolation based zoom-out, (a) Original image, (b) Zoomed-out image	21

Figure 2.12	Synthesis based zooming, (a) Original image, (b) Synthesized image	22
Figure 2.13	(a) LR image, (b) White dotted squares are unknown points, (c) Interpolated image	23
Figure 2.14	Constructing x direction unknown points then y direction of unknown points	23
Figure 2.15	The distances between the known point and a selected finite known neighborhoods around it	24
Figure 2.16	Constructing x direction interpolated points, (a) LR known points, (b) the locations of unknown points and the values of known points, (c) the interpolated values.	25
Figure 2.17	(a) Original image, (b) Magnified image with MF=2, (c) Magnified image with MF=3	26
Figure 2.18	Three common problems of interpolation process (a) Image blurry, (b) Blocking artifacts (c) Edge jaggling	27
Figure 2.19	Interpolation algorithms categories	29
Figure 2.20	Non-adaptive interpolation algorithms	29
Figure 2.21	Pixel Replication Interpolation, (a) Original image, (b) locations of unknown points (c) Interpolated image (Kumar, 2009)	30
Figure 2.22	Example of pixel replication interpolation, (a) LR image, (b) Interpolated image, (c) Original image	30
Figure 2.23	Closest 2 neighborhood of known pixel values surrounding the unknown pixel (Sharmal, 2012)	31
Figure 2.24	Example of bilinear interpolation (a) LR image, (b) Interpolated image, (c) Original image	32

Figure 2.25	Closest 4 neighborhoods of known pixel values surrounding the unknown pixel	33
Figure 2.26	Example of bicubic interpolation (a) LR image, (b) Interpolated image, (c) Original image	33
Figure 2.27	Adaptive interpolation algorithms	34
Figure 2.28	Block diagram of edge-directed algorithms (Che and Cheng, 2004)	35
Figure 2.29	Example of statistical learning-based algorithms (Atkins, 2001)	39
Figure 2.30	Interpolation steps for each local region (Muresan and Parks, 2004)	40
Figure 2.31	Medical application for interpolation based magnification, (a) Unclear tumor (b) Bicubic interpolation MF=8 and brightness 2 times (Salih and Ramly, 2002)	42
Figure 2.32	CT magnification application, (a) LR CT image (b) The LR image magnified by MF=2 (c) The selected part from LR CT image is magnified by MF>10 (Gao et al., 2008)	43
Figure 2.33	Remote sensing application used interpolation based magnification (Jensen, 1996)	44
Figure 2.34	Example of synthesized image problems, (a) Original image, (b) Seams and overlapping problem, (c) Good synthesized image	46
Figure 2.35	Pixel based texture synthesis example (Wei and Levoy, 2000)	48
Figure 2.36	Relationship between time and patch size in pixel based texture synthesis	49
Figure 2.37	Subjective analysis pixel based texture synthesis algorithms for different patch size	49

Figure 2.38	Patch based texture synthesis example	51
Figure 2.39	Relationship between time and patch size in patch based texture synthesis	52
Figure 2.40	Subjective analysis patch based texture synthesis algorithms for different patch size	52
Figure 2.41	Examples of texture synthesis applications	54
Figure 2.42	DCC Interpolation (Zhou et al., 2012)	56
Figure 2.43	Comparison between DCC, Bicubic (Keys, 1981), Bilinear (a) LR image (b) Original image (c) Bilinear interpolation (d) Bicubic interpolation (e) DCC interpolation (Zhou et al., 2012)	57
Figure 2.44	Two steps of ICBI interpolation Algorithm (Giachetti and Asuni, 2011)	58
Figure 2.45	Comparison between ICBI, Bicubic (Keys, 1981), Bilinear (a) LR image, (b) original image (c) Bilinear intrepolation, (d) Bicubic interpolation (e) ICBI (Giachetti and Asuni, 2011)	59
Figure 2.46	Formation of a LR image from a HR image of SAI interpolation	60
Figure 2.47	Comparison between SAI, Bicubic (Keys, 1981), Bilinear (a) LR image (b) Original image (c) Bilinear intrepolation (d) Bicubic interpolation (e) SAI interpolation (Zhang and Wu, 2008)	60
Figure 2.48	Comparison between DFDF, Bicubic (Keys, 1981), Bilinear (a) LR image (b) Original image (c) Bilinear intrepolation (d) Bicubic interpolation (e) DFDF interpolation (Zhang and Wu, 2006)	62
Figure 3.1	The basic concept of the MBMA, (a) LR image, (b) HR image, (Note: as an example, pixel P(0,0) in the LR image has been replaced by $S \times S$ HR block)	69
Figure 3.2	Flow chart of the Online MBMA	71

Figure 3.3	The lookup table which is resulted from the offline MBMA	72
Figure 3.4	Flow chart of the offline MBMA	72
Figure 3.5	Converting from MHR image to MLR image, (a) MHR image, (b) MLR, the top left $S \times S$ HR block of the MHR image is down sampled to the LR pixel $P(0,0)$	73
Figure 3.6	$W \times W$ window around each pixel in the LR image	75
Figure 3.7	Flow chart of feature representation stage	75
Figure 3.8	Examples of (a) $R \times C$ LR image, (b) ELR image with $W = 3$, (c) ELR image with $W = 5$, (d) ELR image with $W = 7$	76
Figure 3.9	ELR image, (a) LR image, (b) LR image with extended top and bottom borders, (c) LR image with extended left and right borders	77
Figure 3.10	3×3 Window around each considered original LR pixel	79
Figure 3.11	Value of FV	79
Figure 3.12	Flow chart of matching stage	80
Figure 3.13	Comparing the considered FV with all MFVs, (a) LR image, (b) comparing FV1 with all MFVs, (c) the lookup table from the offline MBMA	81
Figure 3.14	Mapping the winner MLR pixels with the respective $S \times S$ HR blocks, (a) LR image (b) the look up table introduced by the offline part of the MBMA (c) the magnified HR image.	82
Figure 3.15	Synthesis stage, (a) LR image (b) the HR synthesized image	83
Figure 3.16	Main idea of median filter, (a) the running 3×3 window, (b) replacing the central pixel with the middle value of all entries in the running window	84

Figure 3.17	Flow chart of down sampling stage	85
Figure 3.18	Direct down sampling, (a) MHR image, (b) $P(0,0)$ in the $S \times S$ HR block is selected to be the respective MLR pixel for this block, (c) MLR image	86
Figure 3.19	Flow chart of feature representation stage in offline MBMA	87
Figure 3.20	Images involved in the MBMA and the patch based texture synthesis algorithms, (a) small texture image, (b) larger texture image, (c) LR image, (d) magnified image	89
Figure 3.21	Patch -texture synthesis versus new the proposed MBMA (a) the proposed MBMA (b) Patch-based texture synthesis algorithm	90
Figure 3.22	Interpolation based magnification (a) LR image, (b) original image is expanded and the places of unknown values will be estimated using interpolation to form the magnified image	91
Figure 3.23	Data samples that are used in the MBMA	92
Figure 3.24	Mapping images that are used in the MBMA	93
Figure 3.25	Image of MLCP	94
Figure 3.26	Flow chart of determining the effectiveness of the proposed MBMA	95
Figure 4.1	Magnification performance comparison between using windows sizes 3×3 , 5×5 and 7×7 for the image of Cameraman (a) MBMA_Average (b) MBMA_Direct	103
Figure 4.2	Magnification performance comparison between using windows sizes 3×3 , 5×5 and 7×7 for the image of Pepper (a) MBMA_Average (b) MBMA_Direct	104
Figure 4.3	Magnification performance comparison between using windows sizes 3×3 , 5×5 and 7×7 (a) MBMA_Average (b) MBMA_Direct	104

Figure 4.4	Magnification performance comparison between using windows sizes 3×3 , 5×5 and 7×7 (a) MBMA_Average (b) MBMA_Direct	105
Figure 4.5	Performance comparison for magnifying Cameraman image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA_Direct	109
Figure 4.6	Performance comparison for magnifying Barbara image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA_Direct	111
Figure 4.7	Performance comparison for magnifying Boat image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA_Direct	113
Figure 4.8	Performance comparison for magnifying Pepper image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA_Direct	115
Figure 4.9	Direct down sampling (a) 2×2 HR block (b) the respective MLR pixel	120
Figure 4.10	Performance comparison for magnifying Plate 01 image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA_Direct	122
Figure 4.11	Performance comparison for magnifying Plate 02 image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA_Direct	122
Figure 4.12	Performance comparison for magnifying Plate 03 image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA_Direct	123
Figure 4.13	Performance comparison for magnifying Plate 04 image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA_Direct	124
Figure 4.14	Performance comparison for magnifying Cameraman image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA_Average	130

Figure 4.15	Performance comparison for magnifying Barbara image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA_Average	132
Figure 4.16	Performance comparison for magnifying Boat image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA_Average	134
Figure 4.17	Performance comparison for magnifying Pepper image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA_Average	136
Figure 4.18	Performance comparison for magnifying Cameraman image using (a) ICBI (b) DCC (c) MBMA_Average	141
Figure 4.19	Performance comparison for magnifying Barbara image using (a) ICBI (b) DCC (c) MBMA_Average	141
Figure 4.20	Performance comparison for magnifying Boat image using (a) ICBI (b) DCC (c) MBMA_Average	142
Figure 4.21	: Performance comparison for magnifying Peppers image using (a) ICBI (b) DCC (c) MBMA_Average	142
Figure 4.22	Performance comparison for magnifying Plate01 image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA _ Average	144
Figure 4.23	Performance comparison for magnifying Plate02 image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA _ Average	144
Figure 4.24	Performance comparison for magnifying Plate03 image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f) DCC (g) MBMA_Average	145
Figure 4.25	Performance comparison for magnifying Plate04 image using (a) original image (b) NEDI (c) DFDF (d) SAI (e) ICBI (f)	146

DCC (g) MBMA_Average

- Figure 4.26 Performance comparison for magnifying the MLCP images using MBMA_Direct and MBMA_Average 147
- Figure 4.27 : Magnification of MLCP images by a factor of 3 using the proposed MBMA_Average. 151
- Figure 4.28 Magnification of MLCP images by a factor of 4 using the proposed MBMA_Average 152

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

DCC	Directional Cubic Convolution
DFDF	Directional Filtering and Data Fusion
FSIM	Feature Similarity Index
FV	Feature Vector
GM	Gradient Magnitude
HR	High Resolution
HVS	Human Visual System
LAZA	Locally Adaptive Zooming Algorithm
LR	Low Resolution
MBMA	Mapping Based Magnification Algorithm
MFV	Mapping Feature Vector
MHR	Mapping High Resolution
MLCP	Malaysian License Car Plate
MLR	Mapping Low Resolution
MSE	Mean Square Error
NEDI	New Edge Directed Interpolation
PC	Phase Congruency
PSNR	Peak Signal to Noise Ratio
SAI	Soft Decision Adaptive Interpolation
SSIM	Structural Similarity Index

ALGORITMA PEMBESARAN IMEJ BERDIGIT BAHARU BERDASARKAN INTERGRASI DI ANTARA KONSEP PEMETAAN DAN SINTESIS

ABSTRAK

Pembesaran imej adalah proses pembinaan semula imej resolusi tinggi (HR) dari versi resolusi rendah (LR). Proses pembesaran imej adalah salah satu proses penting yang digunakan untuk memenuhi keperluan manusia. Proses ini digunakan dalam beberapa aplikasi seperti dalam pengimejan perubatan, penderiaan jauh, mempertingkatkan butiran imej dan percetakan. Pada umumnya, algoritma pembesaran yang biasa menggunakan konsep penentudalaman. Walau bagaimanapun, algoritma pembesaran berasaskan penentudalaman ini mengalami masalah seperti kehadiran artifak-artifak yang tidak diingini dalam imej yang diperbesarkan seperti pinggir terhalang dan pinggir kabur. Artifak-artifak ini kebanyakannya muncul pada pinggir yang jelas. Oleh itu, selain menggunakan konsep penentudalaman, kajian ini memberi fokus kepada memperkenalkan algoritmapembesaran yang baharuberasaskan konsep sintesis. Disebabkan oleh konsep sintesis telah digunakan dalam algoritma sintesis tekstur berasaskan tampalan, pengubahsuaian kepada algoritma sintesis tekstur barasaskan tampalan perlu dilakukan agar dapatdigunakanuntutujuan pembesaran imej. Pengubahsuaian yang dicadangkan menghasilkan algoritma pembesaran baharu yang dipanggil Algoritma Pembesaran Barasaskan Pemetaan (MBMA). Algoritma MBMA menggantikan setiap piksel imej LR dengan blok HRdua dimensi untuk membina imej HR. Algoritma yang dicadangkan pada asasnya direka untuk memelihara pinggir

yang jelas. Dua variasi cadangan MBMA diperkenalkan, yaitu MBMA_Average dan MBMA_Direct. Variasi MBMA yang dicadangkan telah dibandingkan dengan teknologiterkini pembesaran algoritma lain menggunakan 100 imej piawai dan 200 imej plat kereta lesen Malaysia (MLCP). MBMA_Average menghasilkan imej pembesaran yang lebih baik dengan pengurangan artifak yang tidak diinginkan (iaitu pengurangan pinggir kabur dan pinggir terhalang) berbanding dengan teknologi algoritma yang lain. Seterusnya, analisis kuantitatif menunjukkan bahawa MBMA_Average yang dicadangkan juga menghasilkan nilai yang terbaik dalam pengukuran PSNR, SSIM, MSE dan FSIM berbanding algoritma-algoritma tersebut.

NEW DIGITAL IMAGES MAGNIFICATION ALGORITHM BASED ON INTEGRATION OF MAPPING AND SYNTHESIS CONCEPT

ABSTRACT

Image magnification is the process of reconstructing High Resolution (HR) image from its Low Resolution (LR) version. Image magnification process is one of the most important processes that is used to fulfill human needs. This process is used in several applications such as in medical imaging, remote sensing, enhancing image details and printing. In general, the common magnification algorithms employ interpolation concept. However, these interpolation-based magnification algorithms suffer from the appearance of undesirable artifacts in magnified images such as edge blocking and edge blurring. These artifacts mostly appear around the strong edges. Therefore, instead of employing interpolation concept, this study focuses in introducing new magnification algorithm based on synthesis concept. As the synthesis concept has been used in patch based texture synthesis algorithms, a modification to the patch based texture synthesis algorithms has to be carried out in order to use it for the image magnification purpose. The proposed modification produces a new magnification algorithm called the Mapping Based Magnification Algorithm (MBMA). The proposed MBMA replaces each pixel in the LR image with a two dimensional HR block to reconstruct the HR image. The proposed algorithm is basically designed to preserve the strong edges. Two variants of the proposed MBMA are introduced, namely MBMA_Average and MBMA_Direct. The proposed MBMA variants have been compared with other state-of-the-art magnification algorithms by using 100 standard images and 200 Malaysian License Car Plate (MLCP) images. The

proposed MBMA_Average produces the best magnified images with less undesirable artifacts (i.e. less of edge blurring and edge blocking) compared with the other state-of-the-art algorithms. Furthermore, the quantitative analyses show that the proposed MBMA_Average also produces the best value of the PSNR, MSE, SSIM and FSIM measurements compared to those algorithms.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In fact, most of the information received by human is in pictorial form. Thus, it is important to apply some operations on the image to get the required information. Image zooming is one of the most important operations in both human and computer vision fields. Zooming an image is the process of changing the number of display pixels per image pixel as well as in physical size (Kumar, 2009; Sharmal, 2012; Sharma1 and Walia, 2013). If the number of the pixels in the zoomed image is larger than the number of pixels in the input image, thus this process is defined as zoom-in or magnification process. On the otherhand, if the number of the new displayed pixels is smaller than the number of pixels in the input image, this is considered as zoom-out process (Abd El-Samie *et al*, 2013;Altunbasak,2010).

For the magnification process, a Low Resoultion (LR) image (i.e. the image that is generated from an imaging system with inadequate detectors (Yang and Huang, 2010)) a High Resoultion (HR) image (i.e. the image that contains more details at particular part in the LR image (Yang and Huang, 2010)) is constructed. This process is very important for specific applications including (but not limited) medical imaging (Salih and Ramly, 2002; Raveendran and Thoms, 2014),remote sensing(Jensen, 1996; DiBiase, 2007) and enhancing image details(Basque Research, 2013; Davis, 1998; Wittman, 2005).

1.2 Current Trend in Image Magnification Algorithms

Several magnification algorithms have been proposed by various researchers. These algorithms depend on using interpolation concept in magnifying the LR image and they can be defined as interpolation based magnification algorithms. Interpolation is the process of estimating the values of function at positions lying between its samples (Wolberg, 1996; Abd El-Samie *et al.*, 2013; Tripathi and Kirar, 2014). The estimation process is achieved by fitting a continuous function through the discrete input samples.

There is an inclusive list of different approaches for interpolation based magnification algorithms. This list can be divided into two approaches namely, adaptive and non-adaptive approaches. Most of adaptive and non-adaptive approaches result in a variety of undesirable artifacts (Atkins *et al.*, 2001; Ouwerkerk, 2006; Altunbasak, 2010; Grover, 2014). These artifacts include edge blocking (Nallaperuma *et al.*, 2006), edge blurring (Singhand Singh, 2013) and fail in preserving image details.

The non-adaptive algorithms treat all pixels equally and they are easy to be implemented. These algorithms include bilinear and cubic convolution. These algorithms are the simplest ones and they are preferred for their low complexity (Thevenaz *et al.*, 2000; Giachetti and Asuni, 2011). However, they suffer from the inability to adapt to varying local structure of the LR image. Furthermore, these algorithms tend to cause undesirable artifacts such as blurring and blocking around edges (Amanatiadis and Andreadis, 2009).

Recently, numerous adaptive interpolation algorithms have been presented in the literature. These algorithms struggled to overcome the shortcomings of the non-adaptive algorithms. Adaptive interpolation algorithms depend on what they are interpolating based on certain information extracted from the structure of the image including edges and smooth areas (Kim, 2014, Li and Orchard, 2001). These algorithms can be classified

as edge-adaptive interpolation, statistical learning-based interpolation, optimal recovery based interpolation and transform domain interpolation (Altunbasak, 2010).

The edge directed interpolation algorithms take into account the edge information in the LR image either explicitly (Chen *et al.*, 2005) or implicitly (Li and Orchard, 2001; Giachetti and Asuni, 2011; Zhou *et al.*, 2012). The subjective quality of the magnified images using these algorithms is improved with higher computational cost. Furthermore, the magnified images have sharper edges than magnified images using the non-adaptive algorithms. However, edge directed algorithms usually cause artifacts in complex edges such as in textures (Amanatiadis and Andreadis, 2009).

The statistical learning-based interpolation algorithms based on the observation that pixels can be classified to different spatial context classes such as edges of different orientation and smooth textures. Then an interpolation filter is designed for the selected class to get the interpolated image (Altunbasak, 2010). These algorithms are considered as the most effective interpolation algorithms since the magnified image has superior visual quality with sharper edges than many other algorithms. However, these algorithms have difficulties dealing with texture areas (Altunbasak, 2010).

The Adaptively Quadratic Interpolation Algorithms (AQUA) are based on specifying the local quadratic signal class from local image patches and then applying optimal recovery to estimate the unknown points. While the AQUA works well for small interpolation factors, the magnified image is deteriorated when interpolating by larger factors (Altunbasak, 2010).

The transform domain interpolation algorithms focus on the use of Wavelet Transform(WT) and Discrete Cosine Transform(DCT) in decomposing the image into specific frequency bands, then process each band separately. The magnified image